## Easterling, Deborah

284316

From:

Easterling, Deborah

Sent:

-Monday-Anril 22 2010 1 05"PM

To:

Subject:

nc. [External] Additional Duke Energy Price increases

Dear Mr. Battocchio,

This is to acknowledge receipt of your Letter of Protest/Comments to the Public Service Commission of South Carolina. Your Letter of Protest/Comments will be placed in the Protest File of the Docket listed below and on the Commission's Website at <a href="https://www.psc.sc.gov">www.psc.sc.gov</a>.

 Docket No. 2019-89-E - Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Approval of Rider 11, Demand-Side Management and Energy Efficiency for 2020

A Protestant is an individual objecting on the ground of private or public interest to the approval of an Application, Petition, Motion or other matters which the Commission may have under consideration. A Protestant may offer sworn testimony but cannot cross-examine witnesses offered by other parties.

According to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, filing a Protest does not make you a Party of Record. A Protestant desiring to become an Intervenor (i.e., a Party of Record) in a proceeding before the Commission may file a Petition for Intervention within the time prescribed by the Commission.

You can follow this Docket and other daily filings made at the Commission by subscribing to the Commission's Email Subscriptions at this link: <a href="https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Email">https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Email</a>; or you can follow the individual Docket at the link listed below:

Docket No. 2019-89-E - Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Approval of Rider 11, Demand-Side Management and Energy Efficiency for 2020 - https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Dockets/Detail/117032.

If we may be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Deborah Easterling Executive Assistant Public Service Commission of South Carolina 803-896-5133

Sign up for Meeting Agenda Alerts: Text PSCAGENDAS to 39492

From: DeSanty, Tricia

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 12:36 PM

To: Easterling, Deborah < Deborah. Easterling@psc.sc.gov>

Cc: Duke, Daphne < Daphne. Duke@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: FW: [External] Additional Duke Energy Price increases

Tricia O. DeSanty
Administrative Coordinator

### Public Service Commission of South Carolina

From: Jim Battocchio

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 12:27 PM

To: PSC\_Commissioner.Ervin < Commissioner.Ervin@psc.sc.gov>

Cc: AMitchell@greenvillenews.com; dal.kalsi@foxcarolina.com; Mark N. Willis <MarkWillis@schouse.gov>;

<u>rossturner@scsenate.gov</u>; PSC\_Commissioner.Randall < <u>Commissioner.Randall@psc.sc.gov</u>>;

PSC\_Commissioner.Williams < <a href="mailto:Commissioner.Williams@psc.sc.gov">Commissioner.Williams@psc.sc.gov</a>; PSC\_Commissioner.Howard

<<u>Commissioner.Howard@psc.sc.gov</u>>; PSC\_Commissioner.Belser<<u>Commissioner.Belser@psc.sc.gov</u>>;

PSC\_Commissioner.Whitfield < Commissioner.Whitfield@psc.sc.gov>; PSC\_Commissioner.Hamilton

<Commissioner.Hamilton@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: [External] Additional Duke Energy Price increases

Dear Tom,

My name is Jim Battocchio and I live in Simpsonville, SC district 4 the area you represent in the Public Service Commission. I am writing to you regarding what I perceive to be excessive energy increases being asked for by Duke Energy during this Calendar Year. I own a small home and use roughly 1500 KW of energy per month. I had emailed my state representatives regarding the first increase that Duke has asked for earlier in the year. After receiving another notice for additional cost increases with my electric bill this month,(2019-89-E) I have done some additional research and now understand how the SCPSC actually works. The General Assembly does not have direct control over the PSC but does by whom they appoint and ultimately approve.

As a regulated (for Profit) company I understand the need for modest price increases due to inflation and changing demographics within the state. However, I do not feel they manage their company in a manner that is fair and just. It appears that they are allowed to run poorly for years and then just raise the prices on the consumers in order to "make up the difference" The latest notice for Docket no. 2019-89-E essentially is asking me to pay an additional \$8.85 per month in the year 2020 - 2021 for a rider that is back dated to issues in 2015! Docket No. 2019-3-E and Docket 2019-4-G is regarding possible Base Rate adjustments based on Fuel costs for both Duke Energy and Piedmont Natural Gas. As these are annual adjustments, I do not have an issue with them as long as they are based on some reasonable standard. If possible could you direct me to the standards they use to calculate the "adjustments" for last year?

If Duke Energy produces an annual budget they should be able to at a minimum develop some type of Rate increase report to the Public Service Commission every two years, so we the consumer don't get hit with the big increases all at once. Additionally, the 3 year plan increase to ease into the higher bills is unethical in my opinion. Each year should be approved separately by the Public Service Commission due to the fact that big changes can happen to the economy in a three year period, AND that there is nothing stopping Duke from continually asking for more like they are doing in 2019-89-E. (they are double dipping in 2020 from 2019-319-E and 2019-89-E and thinking we the consumer will not notice!)

I am attaching some research from the first rate increase which I know will not be the final, but I at least wanted you to see the impact over the next 3 years from my perspective. Then to add the additional \$8.85 in 2020 is insult to injury in my opinion.

Before voting on these, I would respectfully ask you to consider obtaining from and making public ALL the documentation that Duke produces to show it is necessary for that company to stay viable. I would contend that if they are going to hand out Bonuses to their CEO there should be some accountability to the Public regarding rate increases that exceed the rate of inflation and Wage and benefit increases. I have no choice but to buy from Duke Energy, so as a Regulated Monopoly I am asking for you to vote using your best judgement as to what a reasonable increase should be, not what they are asking for.

Respectfully,

Jim Battocchio Simpsonville, SC

### PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA CLERK'S OFFICE REVISED NOTICE OF FILING AND HEARING AND PREFILE DEADLINES

DOCKET NO. 2018-319-E

DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC — Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs

On November 8, 2018, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC ("Duke Energy Carolinas" or the "Company") filed an Application with the Public Service Commission of South Carolina ("Commission") requesting authority to adjust and increase its retail electric rates, charges, and tariffs. The Application was filed pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §§58-27-820 and 58-27-870 and S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 103-303 and 103-823.

In its Application, Duke Energy Carolinas seeks rate changes to increase annual revenues by 10% or \$168 million, to be updated to account for known and measurable expenses for grid investments of approximately \$16 million in 2020 and \$20 million in 2021. The Company states that recent work to modernize the electric system, generate cleaner power, responsibly manage and close coal ash basins, improve reliability, and continually improve service to customers have made it necessary to request a net increase in retail revenues. The Company's request includes \$46 million in net tax benefits resulting from the Federal Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and \$17 million from a reduction in North Carolina state taxes allocable to South Carolina. The Company states in its Application that its request is driven by capital investments and environmental compliance progress made by the Company since its previous rate case, including the further implementation of the Company's generation modernization program, which consists of retiring, replacing and upgrading generation plants; investments in customer service technologies; and the Company's continued investments in base work to maintain its transmission and distribution systems.

The Company also requests approval of its proposed Grid Improvement Plan, adjustments to its Prepaid Advantage Program, and a variety of accounting orders related to ongoing costs for environmental compliance, grid investments between rate changes, incremental depreciation expense and the balance of development costs associated with the cancellation of the Lee Nuclear Project. Finally, the Company seeks approval to establish a reserve and accrual for end of life nuclear costs for nuclear fuel and materials and supplies.

Duke Energy Carolinas requests that the proposed increases be effective on June 1, 2019. According to the Company's proposal in the Application, a typical residential customer using 1,000 kWh will see an increase of approximately \$15.57 per month beginning with the rate effective date in this case, requested to be June 1, 2019, and then an increase of \$1.54 per month beginning June 1, 2020 and an additional \$1,92 per month beginning June 1, 2021, to incorporate costs for grid investments per the Grid Improvement Plan described in the Application. Page 19 of the Application describes the Grid Improvement Plan, which can be described, in part, as a long-term initiative built upon strategic, data driven investments to improve reflability to avoid outages and speed restoration; harden the grid to protect against cyber and physical threats; and to expand solar and other innovative technologies across a two-way, smart-thinking grid. The Company proposes additional rate changes for 2020 and 2021 to reflect the remaining years of the three year plan, with costs captured in a regulatory asset for recovery between rate changes. The Company proposes an increase in the liestidential Basic Facilities Charge from \$8.29 to \$28.00 per month effective June 1, 2019.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

#### CLERK'S OFFICE

REVISED NOTICE OF FILING DOCKET NO. 2019-89-E

# APPLICATION OF DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF RIDER 11. DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (the Company or DEC) has filed an Application for approval of its demand-side management (DSM) and energy efficiency (EE) rider for 2020 (Rider 11) with the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission). Additionally, DEC requests that the Commission allow it to recover the costs of its Interruptible Service and Stand-By Generator programs (Existing DSM Programs) as a component of Rider 11.

The revenue DEC proposes to recover through the proposed Rider 11 is as follows:

- \$37,964,213 for Residential Customers (Exhibit A, Line 16) and
- \$46,376,910 for Non-Residential Customers (Exhibit A, Line 70),

The proposed Rider 11 billing factors include prospective and true-up components. Based on the total costs to be recovered under the proposed Rider 11, as shown on Exhibit A of the Application, the billing factors applicable to South Carolina customers for the billing period fanuary 1, 2020, through December 31, 2020, would be as follows:

Residential Billing Factors		¢/kWh
True-Up Component for Years 2015, 2016, 20 Prospective Component for Vintage Years 20 Residential Rider 11 (Total)		0.0866 0.5055 0.5921 ¢/kWh
Non-Residential Billing Factors Year 2015 EE Participant – True Up		(0.0005)
Year 2015 DSM Participant – True Up	1	(0.0003)
Year 2016 EE Participant - True Up		0.0173
Year 2016 DSM Participant - True Up	For Ave	(0.0001)
Year 2017 EE Participant - True Up		0.0389
Year 2017 DSM Participant - True Up	1500 KWW MO	(0.0022)
Year 2018 EE Participant - True Up		0.0359
Year 2018 DSM Participant - True Up		0.0189
Year 2017 EE Participant - Prospective		0.0244
Year 2018 EE Participant - Prospective		0.0909
Year 2019 EE Participant - Prospective		0.1224
Year 2020 EE Participant - Prospective		0.4175
Year 2020 DSM Participant - Prospective		0.1524

#### Duke Energy proposed Rate increase.

KWh per month	Rate increase	Simpsonville City  Municiple fee increase	Residential basic facility charge increase	Simpsonville city Municiple fee increase	Total monthly increase	
1000	\$15.57	\$0.78	\$19.71	\$0.99	\$37.04	
1500	\$23.36	\$1.17	\$19.71	\$0.99	\$45.22	June 2019-June 2020
1500	\$25.86	\$1.29	\$19.71	\$0.99	\$47.85	June 2020 - June 202
1500	\$28.74	\$1.44	\$19.71	\$0.99	\$50.87	June 2021 -
or an average 1!	500 KWH household t	he annual·increase is as follo	w 201 202	• • • • • •		

2021

\$592.33